

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,017	03/02/2004	Naoto Yajima	249455US0	3570
22850 7590 06/08/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			BERNATZ, KEVIN M	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/08/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	-
10/790,017	YAJIMA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kevin M. Bernatz	1773	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 18 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: The period for reply expires $\underline{5}$ months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). **NOTICE OF APPEAL** 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal: and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: NONE. Claim(s) objected to: NONE. Claim(s) rejected: 6-8. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-6. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11.

The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12.
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). Kevin M. Bernatz, PhD 13. Other: ____. Primary Examiner

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the proposed amendment results in new embodiments not previously considered, thereby requiring further consideration and/or searching. Namely, prior claim 6 did not recite "servo signals" and prior claim 8 did not require the curature limitation of prior claim 7...

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments have been considered, but are not deemed persuasive. Specifically, Applicants argue Stewart fails to teach or suggest a magnetic tape (page 7 of response). The Examiner acknowledges that Stewart fails to teach a magnetic tape, but notes that Applicants' arguments are moot since they are directed to the unentered amendment.

Applicants further argue that Hattori et al. disclose a helical scan tape, not a linear-recording tape (page 8 of response). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. While Hattori et al. may have used a helical scan system for illustrating their tape in their examples, the broad disclosure of Hattori et al. is merely directed to a magnetic tape of any type. Given that the various type of tape systems are well known in the art (as exemplified by the evidentiary web article provied by Applicants), the Examiner does not find Applicants' arguments convincing.

Applicants next argue that Hattori et al. disclose "no curl", hence teaching away from the claimed invention (page 9 of response). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that Hattori et al. disclose overlapping ranges in curl and presently there is no evidence of record that curl within the claimed range limitations results in unexpected results (in either a linear or helical scan apparatus).

Finally, Applicants' argue that the combination of Hattori et al. with Stewart is impropoer since Stewart is not directed to a magnetic tape (page 9 of response). The Examiner respectfully disagrees since "splicing" is well known in the tape art and would be equally applicable to both pure photographic tape, as well as magnetic media.